REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 15, 2009 has been received and considered. In this response, claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 46-49, 50, 59, 63, 67, and 68 have been amended, and claims 72-75 have been added. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Claims 60-62 and 64-66 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-10, 13, 46-54, 57 and 59-70

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-10, 13, 46-54, 57 and 59-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto (U.S. Patent No. 7,280,566) in view of Gentry (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,951).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "selecting a **first start code** from a plurality of available start codes, the first start code indicative of a type of multimedia stream." Claim 46 has been amended to recite similar features. According to the Office Action at page 7, these features are disclosed by Okamoto at col. 13, lines 41-46. The cited portion of Okamoto reads as follows:

> The TSd input start detector 220 detects a start of input of the unit of transfer TSd for each piece of packet data P based on the packet head detection signal Sps and the unit of transfer TSd, and also supplies the packet buffer controller 260 with the unit of transfer TSd whose input has been started.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portion of Okamoto discloses detecting the start of a transfer input **based on a packet head detection signal**. Neither the cited paragraph, nor any other portion of Okamoto discloses or renders obvious **selecting a first start code** from a plurality of available start codes in any manner. In other words, claim 1 provides for selecting a first start code from a plurality of available start codes and processing a first packet of a data stream **based on the selected start code** to determine a result. Okamoto, in contrast, detects the start of a packet and processes the packet based on a predetermined protocol. Okamoto does not **select** a start code from a plurality of available start codes in order to process a packet, as

provided by claim 1. Further, Gentry does not remedy the deficiencies of Okamoto. Accordingly, the cited references, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious at least the above-cited features of claim 1, and the similar features of claim 46.

With respect to independent claim 67, the claim has been amended to recite "selecting a **set of physical interface parameters** from a plurality of available sets of physical interface parameters." According to the Office Action at page 7, these features are disclosed by Okamoto at col. 12, lines 55-59. The cited portion of Okamoto reads as follows: "At this time, the stream input unit TSR.ε. identifies a format, such as the size of a packet contained in the input transport stream." Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portion of Okamoto discloses only that a stream input unit can **identify the size of a packet** contained in a transport stream. Neither the cited portion of Okamoto, nor any other portion discloses or renders obvious **selecting a first set of physical interface parameters** from a plurality of available sets of physical interface parameters in any manner. Further, Gentry does not remedy the deficiencies of Okamoto. Accordingly, the cited references, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious at least the above-cited features of claim 67.

Claims 2-10, 13, and 59 depend from claim 1. Claims 47-54, 57, and 63 depend from claim 46. Claims 68-70 depend from claim 67. Accordingly, the cited references, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious at least one element of each of these dependent claims, at least by virtue of their respective dependence on claims 1, 46, and 67. In addition, these dependent claims recite additional novel elements.

To illustrate, claim 7 recites "wherein the first information [in a generated database] comprises information indicating a network associated with the first data stream." According to the Office Action at page 5, these features are disclosed by Okamoto at column 23, lines 40-46. However, the cited portion of Okamoto discloses only that a packet identifier and a transport stream identifier can be used to activate a packet data filter. Okamoto does not disclose a database including information indicating a network, as provided by claim 7. Further, Gentry does not remedy the deficiencies of Okamoto.

Claims 60-62 and 64-66 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 1-10, 13, 46-54, 57 and 59-70 and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 11, 12, 55, 56 and 71

At page 7 of the Office Action, claims 11, 12, 55, 56 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto in view of Gentry, and in further view of the Examiner's Official Notice. Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 1, claims 55 and 56 depend from claim 46, and claim 71 depends from claim 67. As explained above, Okamoto and Gentry do not disclose or suggest at least one element of each of claims 1, 46, and 67. Further, the Official Notice taken by the Office does not remedy the deficiencies of the other cited references. Accordingly, the cited art does not disclose or suggest at least one element of these dependent claims, at least by virtue of their respective dependence on claims 1, 46, and 67. Further, these dependent claims recite additional novel elements.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 11, 12, 55, 56, and 71 and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

New Claims 72-75

Claims 72-75 have been added, and recite features not disclosed by the cited references. For example. Claim 72, from which claims 73-75 depend, recites "**selecting a first packet length from a plurality of available packet lengths** [and] processing a first packet of the first data stream based on the first packet length to determine a first processed result." According to the Office Action at page 7 these features are disclosed by Okamoto at col. 12, lines 55-59. However, as explained above, the cited portion of Okamoto discloses only that a stream input unit can **identify** the size of a packet contained in a transport stream. Neither the cited portion of Okamoto, nor any other portion discloses or renders obvious **selecting** a first packet length from a plurality of available packet lengths and processing a first packet based on the first packet lengths in any manner. Further, Gentry does not remedy the deficiencies of Okamoto. Accordingly, the cited references, individually and in combination, fail to disclose or render obvious at least the above-cited features of claim 72. Accordingly, consideration and allowance of claims 72-75 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicant believes no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 01-0365.

Respectfully submitted,

  /Adam D. Sheehan/   October 13, 2009
Adam D. Sheehan; Reg. No. 42,146   Date
LARSON NEWMAN & ABEL, LLP
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)